JS 44 (Rev. 07/16)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the erri at	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		95,41,61,000,000,100,000				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS MIDLAND FUNDING LLC			
ELIZANDRA CRUZ				MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC.			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff El Paso County, Texas (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			as	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Joseph M. Adams, Esq. Law Office of Joseph M. Adams 200 Highpoint Dr, Ste 211A, Chalfont, PA 18914 Tel: 215-996-9			977	Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citiz	en of This State		PTF DEF	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2		
				en or Subject of a oreign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT							
CONTRACT		RTS		ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	20 Marine 30 Miller Act 40 Negotiable Instrument 50 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 51 Medicare Act 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other		□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC ☐ 3729(a)) ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation	
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	□ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	□ 72 □ 74 □ 73	LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation	370 Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization: 361 HIA (1395ff)		
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION		91 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	Act	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Habeas Corpus: ☐ 463 Alien Detainee ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence ☐ 530 General		Income Security Act	□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of	
□ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education	☐ 535 Death Penalty Other: ☐ 540 Mandamus & Othe ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement		IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization Application 65 Other Immigration Actions		State Statutes	
	T :	Remanded from Appellate Court		nstated or	r District Litigation		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON Brief description of ca	n 227, et seq.		Do not cite jurisdictional state	*	er Protection Act	
Defendant used autodialer to Plaintif VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: □ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.				EMAND \$	CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No		
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		2	DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 02/13/2017		SIGNATURE OF ATT	ORNEY	OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		0					
RECEIPT# AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE	

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

ELIZANDRA CRUZ

CIVIL ACTION

v.	:					
MIDLAND FUNDING, LLC, et al	: . :					
	:	NO.				
	;					
In accordance with the Civil Justic plaintiff shall complete a Case Man filing the complaint and serve a copy side of this form.) In the event the designation, that defendant shall, wi plaintiff and all other parties, a Cas which that defendant believes the co	agement Track Designation Form y on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of at a defendant does not agree was th its first appearance, submit to the se Management Track Designation	n in all civil cases at the to the plan set forth on the pith the plaintiff regarding the clerk of court and serve	ime of reverse ag said on the			
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOW	VING CASE MANAGEMENT T	ΓRACKS:				
a) Habeas Corpus - Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
(b) Social Security - Cases requesting	ng review of a decision of the Sec	retary of Health				
and Human Services denying pla	aintiff Social Security Benefits.		()			
(c) Arbitration - Cases required to b	be designated for arbitration under	r Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()			
(d) Asbestos - Cases involving clair exposure to asbestos.	ms for personal injury or property	damage from	()			
(e) Special Management - Cases the commonly referred to as complet the court. (See reverse side of the management cases.)	at do not fall into tracks (a) through and that need special or intense his form for a detailed explanation	management by	()			
(f) Standard Management - Cases the	hat do not fall into any one of the	other tracks.	(X)			
February 13, 2017	Just Tykhow	Joseph M. Adams, Esc	l •			
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for Plai	intiff			
215-996-9977	215-996-9111	josephmadamsesq@verizon.net				
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address				
(Civ. 660) 10/02						

Case 2:17-cv-00667-MMB Document 1 Filed 02/13/17 Page 3 of 10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar. Address of Plaintiff; c/o Law Office of Joseph M. Adams, 200 Highpoint Drive, Suite 211A, Chalfont, PA 18914 Address of Defendant: 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 1300, San Diego, California 92108 Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? No□ Ves (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Date Terminated: Case Number: ____ Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year p Yes□ terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes□ CIVIL: (Place / in one category only) B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: A. Federal Question Cases: 1.

Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 1.

Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2.

Airplane Personal Injury 2. D FELA 3.

Assault, Defamation 3.

Jones Act-Personal Injury 4.

Marine Personal Injury 4.

Antitrust 5.

Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 5. □ Patent 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 7. D Products Liability 7.

Civil Rights 8.

Products Liability — Asbestos 8.

Habeas Corpus 9.

All other Diversity Cases 9. D Securities Act(s) Cases (Please specify) 10. □ Social Security Review Cases 🔀 All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 47 U.S.C. Section 227, et seq ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) counsel of record do hereby certify: L Joseph M. Adams, Esq. □ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: February 13, 2017 Attorney I.D.# Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending of within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. 58430 DATE: February 13, 2017 Attorney I.D.#

Attorney-at-Law

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ELIZANDRA CRUZ,

an individual,

: CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff,

v.

No.:

MIDLAND FUNDING LLC,

a foreign limited liability company,

and MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC.,

a foreign for-profit corporation,

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

COMES NOW, Plaintiff, ELIZANDRA CRUZ (hereinafter, "Plaintiff"), by and through the undersigned counsel, and hereby sues Defendants, MIDLAND FUNDING LLC (hereinafter, "MF") and MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC. (hereinafter, "MCM") (hereinafter

collectively, "Defendants"). In support thereof, Plaintiff states:

INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This is an action for damages brought by an individual consumer for Defendants' violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 United States Code, Section 227 (hereinafter, the "TCPA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 47 United States Code, Section 227(b)(3) and
 United States Code, Section 1337.
- 2. Venue in this District is proper because Defendants transact business in this District and the conduct complained of occurred in this District.

- 3. At all material times herein, Plaintiff is an individual who resided in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.
- 4. At all material times herein, MF is a foreign limited liability company existing under the laws of the state of Delaware and engaged in business in Pennsylvania, with its principal place of business located at 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 1300, San Diego, California 92108, that, itself and through its subsidiaries, regularly purchases and collects defaulted consumer debts from residents in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 5. At all material times herein, MCM is a foreign for-profit corporation existing under the laws of the state of Kansas and engaged in business in Pennsylvania, with its principal place of business located at 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 1300, San Diego, California 92108, that, itself and through its subsidiaries, regularly collects defaulted consumer debts owed or asserted to be owed to MF from residents in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 6. At all material times herein, Defendants act themselves or through their agents, employees, officers, members, directors, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, third-party vendors, and insurers.
- 7. Upon information and belief, MF purchased debt allegedly owed by Plaintiff after such debt entered default.
 - 8. Upon information and belief, MF assigned Plaintiff's debt to MCM for collection.
- 9. At all material times herein, MCM acted on MF's behalf, and with MF's knowledge, consent, and approval when MCM made telephone calls to Plaintiff in its attempts to collect the debt.
- 10. All necessary conditions precedent to the filing of this action occurred or Defendants waived.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. MCM made telephone calls, as more specifically alleged below, to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number 484.XXX.8070 using an automatic telephone dialing system (hereinafter, "ATDS"), a predictive telephone dialing system (hereinafter, "PTDS"), or an artificial or pre-recorded voice (hereinafter, "APV").
- 12. At all material times herein, Plaintiff is the owner, regular user, and possessor of a Cellular Telephone with assigned number 484.XXX.8070 (hereinafter, "Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone").
- 13. At no time herein did Defendants possess prior express consent to call Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using an ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV.
- 14. At no time herein did Defendant possess prior express consent to call Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone as Plaintiff obtained Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone number after MF acquired the debt it attempted to collect from Plaintiff.
- 15. Additionally, if Defendants contend they made the below-referenced phone calls for "informational purposes only," they nevertheless lacked the required prior express written consent necessary to place such informational calls to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using an ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV.
- 16. MCM made each call to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone on MF's behalf, and with MF's consent, knowledge, and approval.
- 17. Despite lacking prior express consent, from approximately January 2014 through 2015, Defendants made approximately three (3) calls every day to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using an ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV.
- 18. As of September 1, 2016, Plaintiff retained Leavengood, Dauval, Boyle & Meyer, P.A. and the Law Office of Joseph M. Adams (hereinafter collectively "Undersigned Counsel")

for representation with respect to her TCPA claims against Defendants.

- 19. Plaintiff retained Undersigned Counsel for the purpose of pursuing this matter against Defendants, and Plaintiff is obligated to pay her attorneys a reasonable fee for their services.
- 20. Plaintiff has not been able, due to both professional and/or personal commitments, as well as the continued and increasing stress associated with the continued barrage of autodialed telephone calls, to record the specifics on each and every call made to Plaintiff by Defendants. Plaintiff asserts, however, that the above-referenced calls are but a subset and general description of the total calls she is aware of and that each caused emotional distress, anxiety, and inability to use her Cellular Telephone when Defendants made such calls, all made in violation of the TCPA. Moreover, Defendants are in the best position to determine and ascertain the number and methodology of calls made to Plaintiff.
- 21. United States Code, Title 47, Section 227(b)(3) provides for the award of \$500.00 or actual damages, whichever is greater, for each telephone call made to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using any ATDS, PTDS, or APV to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone in violation of the TCPA or the regulations prescribed thereunder.
- 22. Additionally, the TCPA, Section 227(b)(3) allows the trial court to increase the damages up to three times, or \$1,500.00, for each telephone call made to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using any ATDS, PTDS, or APV to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone in willful or knowing violation of the TCPA or the regulations prescribed thereunder.

COUNT ONE: TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACTVIOLATION OF 47 UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 227(b)(1)(A)

Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs one (1) through twenty-two (22) as if fully restated herein and further states as follows:

- 23. Defendants are both subject to, and each violated the provisions of, 47 United States Code, Section 227 (b)(1)(A) by using an ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV to call a telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service without Plaintiff's prior express consent.
- 24. At no time herein did Defendants possess consent to call Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using an ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV.
- 25. Despite lacking Plaintiff's prior express consent, MCM, on MF's behalf—and with MF's consent, knowledge, and approval—used and ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV to make calls to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone *at least* three (3) times a day from approximately January 2014 through 2015.
- 26. The phone calls MCM made to Plaintiff on MF's behalf—and with MF's consent, knowledge, and approval—are the result of a repeated willful and knowing violation of the TCPA.
 - 27. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff suffered:
 - a. The periodic loss of her cellular telephone service;
 - b. Lost material costs associated with the use of peak time cellular telephone minutes allotted under her cellular telephone service contract; and
 - c. Emotional distress, anxiety, loss of sleep, and deterioration of relationships, both personal and professional, as a result of the repeated willful and knowing calls placed in violation of the TCPA.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, as a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff respectfully requests entry of:

- a. Judgment against Defendants declaring that Defendants violated the TCPA;
- b. Judgment enjoining Defendants from making further autodialed phone calls to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone;

c. Judgment for Plaintiff against Defendants awarding the greater of actual damages or statutory damages in the amount of \$500.00 for each of Defendants' telephone calls to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone in violation of the TCPA;

d. Judgment for Plaintiff against Defendants awarding treble damages in the amount of an additional \$1,000.00 for each telephone call made to the Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone in violation of the TCPA where Defendants acted knowingly and/or willfully; and

e. Any other such relief the Court may deem proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues triable by right.

SPOLIATION NOTICE AND DEMAND TO RETAIN EVIDENCE

Plaintiff hereby gives notice to Defendants and demands that Defendants and their affiliates safeguard all relevant evidence—paper, electronic documents, or data—pertaining to this litigation as required by law.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joseph M. Adams, Esq., PBN 58430

ph 77 01-

Law Office of Joseph M. Adams 200 Highpoint Drive, Suite 211A

Chalfont, PA 18914 Phone: (215) 996-9977

Fax: (215) 996-9111

josephmadamsesq@verizon.net

and

Ian R. Leavengood, Esq., FBN 0010167 Aaron M. Swift, Esq., FBN 093088 Gregory H. Lercher, Esq., FBN 0106991 Sara J. Weiss, Esq., FBN 0115637 LeavenLaw, P.A.

Northeast Professional Center

3900 First Street North, Suite 100 St. Petersburg, FL 33703 Phone: (727) 327-3328 Fax: (727) 327-3305 consumerservice@leavenlaw.com aswift@leavenlaw.com glercher@leavenlaw.com sweiss@leavenlaw.com pro hac vice application forthcoming Attorneys for Plaintiff